



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,327	02/06/2006	Christopher G Steel	GB 020197	5733

24737 7590 02/14/2011
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

GONZALEZ, AMANCIO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/14/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/535,327	STEEL, CHRISTOPHER G	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AMANCIO GONZALEZ	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, and 3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/03/2011 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 02/03/2011 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2617

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herle et al. (US Pat 7013391), hereafter “Herle,” in view of Kempf et al. (US 20030211842 A1), hereafter “Kempf.”

Consider **claim 1** as amended. Herle discloses:

a method of distributing the location of a mobile device (**see the title, col. 6 lines 61-63, where Herle discusses a method for distributing the location of a mobile device**);

determining the location of the mobile device (**see the abstract, col. 1, lines 22-27**);

encrypting the determined location using an encryption key (**see the abstract, fig. 2**);

transmitting the encrypted location to a server (**see fig. 4, step 415, col. 6, lines 41-46**);

storing the encrypted location at the server (**see fig. 4, step 415, col. 6 lines 46-48**). Herle discloses querying the server from a remote terminal (**see fig. 4, step 420, col. 6, lines 48-50**);

transmitting from the server to the remote terminal the encrypted location in response to the query (**fig. 4, step 425; col. 6, lines 54-56**);

sharing the predetermined encryption key between the mobile device and the remote terminal (**see col. 5 lines 6-12, where Herle specifies that “*The use of encryption-decryption keys enables the mobile station to give its location out***

Art Unit: 2617

*only to those having authorization from the mobile station user,” i.e., another mobile terminal user), but does not explicitly refer to **not sharing the encryption key with the server**. However, Herle states that “**MS position server application program 330 may also be responsible for controlling access to mobile station database 360 (see col. 6 lines 1-3)** and, furthermore, Herle also discloses in step 425 of figure 4 an embodiment in which the server **transmits the encrypted position data to the client device which then decrypts the position data** (see col. 6 lines 52-56) that which would have make obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to see the suggestion of another embodiment implementation of the invention wherein the MS does not share with the server the use of the **encryption-decryption key that enables the mobile station to give its location out only to those having authorization from the mobile station user**, as stated in the quotation of col. 5 lines 6-12 above); and Herle further discloses*

decrypting the location at the remote terminal using the predetermined encryption key (**fig. 1, col. 6 lines 54-60**).

But Herle is not explicit, or is silent, regarding attaching the encryption key to a communication between the mobile device and the remote terminal, wherein the encryption key is not shared with the server.

Kempf, in analogous art, suggests the aforesaid limitation (**see Abstract, [0052], and fig. 2, where Kempf discusses wherein a mobile node and a correspondent node share a secret key independent of a particular server**).

It would therefore have been obvious, at the time of invention, to combine Herle and Kempf for the purpose of enhancing security between electronic communication devices.

Consider **claim 2** as amended. Herle discloses:

a mobile phone that determines its location, encrypts its location using an encryption key (**abstract; fig. 2**), transmits the encrypted location to a server (**abstract; fig. 1; col. 1, lines 22-27; fig. 4, steps 410 and 411: MS 111 accesses MS location server 160 and establishes a secure connection and transmits encrypted location data to MS location server 160**), and shares the predetermined encryption key with a remote terminal (**MS location server 160 –fig. 1, col. 6, lines 54-56- transmits the encrypted MS 111 position data to the client access device, which then decrypts the MS 111 position data: only mobile station and the remote terminal share encryption key in this embodiment of the invention**).

But Herle is not explicit, or is silent, regarding attaching the encryption key to a communication between the mobile device and the remote terminal, wherein the encryption key is not shared with the server.

Kempf, in analogous art, suggests the aforesaid limitation (**see Abstract, [0052], and fig. 2, where Kempf discusses wherein a mobile node and a correspondent node share a secret key independent of a particular server**).

It would therefore have been obvious, at the time of invention, to combine Herle and Kempf for the purpose of enhancing security between electronic communication devices.

Consider **claim 4** as amended. Herle:

discloses a terminal that queries a remote server for the location of a particular mobile device with which it has shared an encryption key independently of the server (terminal: reads access device -fig. 1; **(fig. 4, step 420; col. 6, lines 48-50; claim 15)**; and upon receipt of an encrypted location encrypted with the encryption key, decrypting the location **(MS location server 160 –fig. 1, col. 6, lines 54-56- transmits the encrypted MS 111 position data to the client access device, which then decrypts the MS 111 position data).**

But Herle is not explicit, or is silent, regarding sharing the encryption key via an attachment to a communication between the mobile devices.

Kempf, in analogous art, suggests the aforesaid limitation **(see Abstract, [0052], and fig. 2, where Kempf discusses wherein a mobile node and a correspondent node share a secret key independent of a particular server).**

It would therefore have been obvious, at the time of invention, to combine Herle and Kempf for the purpose of enhancing security between electronic communication devices.

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 **or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Amancio González, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1106. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost, can be reached at (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/AMANCIO GONZALEZ/
February 7, 2011